

## REMARKS

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the detailed remarks and analysis. Claims 23-36 remain pending, claims 37-42 are withdrawn and claims 1-22 and 43-44 are cancelled.

### New Matter

Applicant respectfully traverses the new matter rejection with regard to the amendment to the specification to refer to a citation to priority documents. This is not new matter as applicant has the right to claim priority to the documents and applications specified. The citation to priority documents is not new matter. Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

### § 112 Rejection

Claims 23-34 and 36 have been amended to correct the informalities noted by the Examiner. The claims now comply with 35 U.S.C. 112. No new matter has been entered.

### § 103 Rejection

Claims 23, 29, 32 and 36 are not obvious over Enomoto et al. (US 5568962) in view of Maehara (US 5069508) and Hinz et al. (US 6007162) and Halsey et al. (US 3133611) and Okano (US 2005/0218856) because the proposed combination cannot disclose nor suggest the required features. Claim 23 requires well that the inlet valves the electronic control unit and the brake instruction detection device are attached directly to the valve block in such a manner that electrical, magnetic and thermal signal and power transmissions occur without separate electrical conduits. Support for this amendment can be found on page 8 of the specification along with originally filed figures and original claim 5. .At least this feature is not disclosed not suggested by the proposed combination and therefore this rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 24-27 depend from an allowable base claim and are therefore also in allowable form. The addition of Iwamoto et al. (US 6354674) does not correct the problems with the base combination.

Claim 28 depends from an allowable base claim and are therefore also in allowable form. The addition Joyce et al. (US 5971503) does not correct the problems with the base combination.

Claim 30 depends from an allowable base claim and are therefore also in allowable form. The addition of Burgdorf et al. (US 5219442) does not correct the problems with the base combination.

Claim 31 depends from an allowable base claim and is therefore also in allowable form. The addition of Hendrickson (US 4736992) does not correct the problems with the base combination.

Claims 33 and 34 depend from an allowable base claim and are therefore also in allowable form. The addition of view of Kusano (US 6290310) does not correct the problems with the base combination. Accordingly, Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections based on the combination of Enomoto et al. (US 5568962) in view of Maehara (US 5069508) and Hinz et al. (US 6007162) and Halsey et al. (US 3133611) and Okano (US 2005/0218856).

Applicant believes that no additional fees are necessary; however, the Commissioner is authorized to charge to Deposit Account No. 50-1482, in the name of Carlson, Gaskey & Olds, P.C., for any additional fees or credit any overpayment.

Respectfully Submitted,

**CARLSON, GASKEY & OLDS, P.C.**

/John M. Siragusa/

John M. Siragusa  
Registration No. 46,174  
400 West Maple Road, Suite 350  
Birmingham, Michigan 48009  
Telephone: (248) 988-8360  
Facsimile: (248) 988-8363

Dated: December 16, 2011